



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

for Pius IX., who, on 8th December, 1854, without the aid of a general council, or even going through the form of consulting the bishops who by his invitation went to Rome to join in this pontifical triumph, did what neither Sixtus IV. or Alexander VII. was able to do, though he (Pius IX.) admittedly possesses no more supreme power and no greater infallibility than either of them.

No one, we think, can read the following without being convinced that Pope Alexander VII., in the year 1661, went as far as he could then venture to do, having regard to the existing state of opinions, and that if he did not define the new dogma two centuries ago, it was not from want of will, but want of power to enforce his decree, if he had ventured on a step so hazardous:—

"It is an ancient devotion of the faithful in Christ towards the most blessed mother the Virgin Mary to believe that her soul, in the first instant of its creation, was preserved exempt from the spot of original sin by a special grace and privilege, by the merits of Jesus Christ her Son, the Redeemer of the human race, and to celebrate solemnly the feast of the conception in this belief. The number of the faithful and this worship have increased since the apostolical constitution which our predecessor, Sixtus IV., of happy memory, published to recommend it, and which the Council of Trent has renewed and commanded to be observed. This devotion and worship towards the Holy Virgin has made new progress, since, with the approbation of the Roman Pontiffs, a religious order has been founded and confraternities established under this title, and indulgences have been granted to them by the Popes, so that several celebrated universities have joined themselves to this opinion, and almost all Catholics have now embraced this belief. But since, by reason of the contrary opinion, some maintained in their sermons, in their lessons of theology, and in public theses, that the Blessed Virgin Mary was conceived with original sin, and scandals, disputes, and dissensions offensive to God have arisen among Christian people, Paul V., of happy memory, our predecessor, forbade them to teach publicly, or to preach opinions contrary to that of which we have spoken above; and Gregory XV., also our predecessor, not being content with this prohibition, extended it to private conferences, and, moreover, ordered in favour of this same opinion that in the sacrifice of the mass, and in celebrating the divine office, both in public and private, they should use no other term than that of '*the conception*.' However, as almost all the bishops of Spain, and Philip, the Catholic King of Spain, have represented to us that in that country some persons, continuing to defend the contrary opinion in spite of the aforesaid prohibitions, attack and decry, both in private and in public, the Immaculate Conception, and so interpret the privilege which the sovereign Pontiffs have granted to this devotion and festival that they destroy it altogether, and even dare to deny that the Roman Church favours this opinion and devotion, whence the disorders, scandals, and divisions, which our predecessors, Paul V. and Gregory XV., wished to prevent, continue still to this day, and there is reasonable ground to fear that this diversity of opinions may produce in future still greater evils.

"Now, we having taken into consideration that the holy Roman Church solemnly celebrates the fête of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, and that it has formerly ordained a special office for it, according to the pious, devout, and laudable institution of our predecessor Sixtus IV., and being desirous, according to the examples of the Roman Pontiffs, our predecessors, to show ourselves favourable to this laudable piety and devotion, and to this festival and worship, which has not changed in the Roman Church since its first institution, \* \* \* \* \* we renew the constitutions and decrees of the Pontiffs, our predecessors, and especially those of Sixtus IV., Paul V., and Gregory XV., issued in favour of the opinion which holds that the soul of the Blessed Virgin Mary in its creation, and when it was united to her body, was preserved from original sin; and likewise in favour of the festival and worship which they render to the Conception of the Virgin in consequence of this opinion." \* \* \* \* \*

The Bull then goes on to prohibit preaching or publishing anything contrary to the "pious opinion," and then proceeds thus:—

"We prohibit to all sorts of persons, conformably to the constitution of Sixtus IV., to assert either that those who hold the contrary opinion, to wit, that the glorious Virgin Mary was conceived with original sin, are heretics, or that they have become guilty of mortal sin, since the Roman Church and the Holy See have not yet decided on this matter, as we now, ourselves, by no means wish or intend to decide thereupon; and even in addition to the penalties to which Sixtus IV. and other Roman Pontiffs, our predecessors, have subjected those who have dared to condemn the contrary opinion of heresy, or of mortal sin, or impiety, we subject them to still more grave punish-

ment, such as we have above imposed upon those who may violate this constitution; and it is our will that not only the bishops and prelates superior, but the local ordinaries, and even the inquisitors of heresy, wherever deputed, should proceed against, and make search for, and punish severely those who shall contravene this present constitution, whether regulars, of whatsoever order they may be, even the Company of Jesus, or ecclesiastical and secular persons, of whatever sort, state, rank, or condition soever they may be. \* \* \* \* \* Given at Rome under the ring of the fisherman this 8th December, 1661, and of our Pontificate the Seventh."

We ask any intelligent Roman Catholic who is disposed to attach value to the boasted living power in the Church to decide controversies, whether this was not the time for the Pope to have shown his infallible and supreme power as Vicar and Vicegerent of Christ? and can any one believe that Alexander VII. would not have done it, if he had not well known that such an assumption would, if attempted, have proved a perfect failure, and only further fomented the strife and scandal which he desired to appease, if he had only possessed the power to do so?

If the Popes be the appointed Vicars and Vicegerents of Christ upon earth, was it not a base dereliction of duty and abdication of their Divine functions in Alexander VII. and his predecessors to allow such bitter conflicts and notorious scandals to rage within the Church for centuries, and yet deliberately to announce to the world that they did not even *wish* to put an end to the disputes by deciding on which side the real truth was, as Pius IX. did boldly, after the lapse of several centuries, when all dissension upon the matter had long since died out of itself among the adherents of the Church of Rome?

#### TRANSLATION OF A LETTER SENT IN AUGUST, 1856, TO POPE PIUS IX., BY THE ARCHBISHOP OF UTRECHT, AND THE BISHOPS OF HAARLEM AND DEVENTER.

"Most Holy Father—In the year of the incarnation of our Lord, 1854, on the 8th December, was solemnly proclaimed by your Holiness, in St. Peter's, the Immaculate Conception of the Holy Virgin, mother of our Redeemer, as though it were a dogma of the Christian faith. We are unable to express how very greatly this circumstance has astonished, nay even afflicted us. We shall probably be blamed for having so long deferred expressing our sentiments upon this extraordinary event. The orthodox faith of the Church of Utrecht is more than sufficiently known throughout the Catholic world. That this Church should directly, and at once, have rejected the new and false doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the most Holy Virgin Mary is, doubtless, the sentiment of all true Catholics, but, in her opinion, this feeling is not a reason strong enough to withhold her from openly opposing it now. Indeed, that we should openly repudiate and oppose it is due alike to the dignity of our office, to the Catholic faith, and to defenders of the truth.

"We should consider ourselves as unfaithful to our duty if we remained longer silent on this subject. The true faith, in which, from our very infancy, we have been instructed, forbids us to be silent. However unworthy we may be of the office we hold, it is our bounden duty to publish to the eye and ear of the Catholic Church our sentiments respecting these events. We are fully convinced that nothing can be added to or taken away from the faith once delivered to the saints. To us, as bishops of the Catholic Church, is committed the undefiled keeping of that faith. 'That good thing which was committed unto thee, keep,' so wrote Paul the Apostle to his dearly beloved son, Timothy. Then St. Vincent of Lerins considers this as not addressed to Timothy alone—as many prelates as would succeed Timothy in the aforesaid character must consider these words as addressed to themselves. The opinion respecting the immaculate conception of our Lord's mother, Mary, publicly and solemnly proclaimed, would increase that faith once so delivered. Prior to the 11th century of the birth of Christ such a privilege of the blessed Virgin has never and nowhere been known. Whether we turn to the Eastern or to the Western Church, and question both parts of the Catholic world, not the least trace of such a sentiment is to be found before the above stated period. Whether we address the popes, your predecessors, before the aforesaid century, we are fully convinced that such a sentiment was not felt by either of them. It would even be easy for us to point out instances of their contrary mode of thinking. Let us listen to what Innocent III. and V., and to what Clement VI. says: 'We could easily quote passages from the Holy Scriptures which are diametrically in contradiction with the new doctrine. Therefore out of these two sources, of God's Word and tradition, nothing can be extracted in favour of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin mother of our Lord. Therefore, for the keeping of the deposit of faith, we exclaim with a loud voice against this doctrine; affirming that it is branded on the forehead with the mark 'novelty.' This first and important motive prompts us to express our sentiments upon this subject.

"Neither were those bishops of the Catholic Church at liberty to express their sentiments upon this doctrine; and this is the second complaint which we have to bring before your Holiness. The office of judge belongs to all the bishops—that

peculiar privilege of the episcopal character is here in no wise regarded; no regard has been had to the opinion of the prelates as a body; no ear has been lent to the voices of their churches, but simply from the voices of those who went to Rome was any sentiment heard upon this subject. And assuredly the right of judgment is a privilege due to the bishops. The Council of Jerusalem, the first and the pattern of all synods, evidently grants them this right. After the Head of the Apostles, St. Peter, had spoken, St. James stood up, saying: '*My sentence is*, Acts xv. 19. Now, what bishops (as the successors and substitutes of the Apostles) were in office when you proclaimed this new doctrine? They were, for a certainty, either stupid, dumb witnesses, or else base flatterers—therefore with what contempt is the episcopal dignity treated in an apparently respectable conclave! no dauntless sentinel was to be seen at his post. Most holy father, with your leave be it said, in order to raise the Head higher than it should be the most illustrious members of the body have been crushed. Thanks to heaven, we have not yet forgotten the rank we hold, and we therefore complain to you of the injustice done to us respecting it.

"We are urged by a third reason, viz., charity towards our Church, to reject the fabulous dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Holy Virgin. This charity demands our utmost care to guard her free from all false doctrines. Thanks to heaven, the faith of our Church has remained undefiled until the present day; though her foundations, in this country, have frequently been shaken. We consider it as our duty to remove from her all innovations respecting the truth of her faith. For the last three years a confusion has intruded itself into the ecclesiastical ordinances in this country, therefore our faith is in danger of being polluted, and it is our object to prevent this danger. We must endeavour, by all possible means, to present that Church as a pure bride to Jesus. To bequeath the faith of our forefathers as simple and pure to our posterity as we have received it from our ancestors is with us an object of great importance. Rejecting every innovation, and attached to ancient rites, we thus, with Tertullian, sue to separate the true doctrine from the false: 'What was first delivered came undeniably from God, and is truth; that which has been introduced at a later period is foreign and false' (Lib. de Præser, cap. 31). This exhortation is directed to ourselves just as much as to Timothy by the teacher of the Gentiles, viz., to 'avoid profane and vain babblings' (1 Tim. vi. 20). The innovation of words, that is, of doctrine, things, and opinions which are contrary to olden times: 'Should such innovations be adopted, why then the faith of our blessed forefathers must necessarily be entirely, or for the most part, violated.' These are the words of St. Vincent of Lerins (Commonit. c. 24).

"About 200 years ago, the ambassador of the Spanish king, Philip IV., requested in his master's name, that your predecessor Alexander the VII. should give him a positive answer respecting the Immaculate Conception of the Holy Virgin. This prelate addressed the following questions to Cardinal Bona: whether he could decide this difference? 'That neither the Pope himself, nor the Church, was able to establish new articles of faith; but only declare what God may have revealed to His Church, after the traditions handed down to us by the Apostles were duly examined, down to the present time. Such was the answer of that pious and learned Cardinal. 'Should I not,' repeated the Pope, 'by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, be able to determine what ought to be your opinion respecting this difference?' 'To you, and you only, most holy father, could anything revealed unto you from God be of any service. From this it is not to be inferred that you could be at liberty to oblige the faithful and myself to accept your verdict.' Such were the reasonings of Bona. O may this most wise, most genuine catholic sentiment, be embraced by all the successors of St. Peter. We have considered it not only an honour, but also a duty on our part to offer to your Holiness our Pastoral Instruction, which we forward to you with this letter; and in order that the Catholics of the Netherlands, and more especially in our own parishes, should be better acquainted with what they should think of this new doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Holy Virgin, we have published it in the language of the country. Our Church has repeatedly expressed a desire for a General Council, and it appears that it is now needful to repeat this appeal. On account of a violation of the pledge of faith, and on account of the injustice committed towards Episcopacy, at the time the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Holy Virgin Mary, mother of our Saviour, was established, as though this were a Divine revelation, we retain the right of making an appeal, when time and opportunity present, to a future General Council. May the Father of light open the eyes of our heart, and work in us that which is well pleasing in His sight. With the most profound respect, we the undersigned are, most Holy Father,

Your Holiness's most humble servants,

(Signed)

JOHN, Archbishop of Utrecht,  
HENRY JOHN, Bishop of Haarlem,  
HERMAN, Bishop of Deventer.

#### Correspondence.

##### ON THE INVOCATION OF SAINTS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—As a good action cannot be too often repeated, allow me to refer you again to CATHOLIC LAYMAN for June, 1854, page 71, column 1, where you insinuate that it is *not practically true* that Catholics say, when addressing God, "Have mercy on us; forgive us our sins;" and, when addressing the Blessed Virgin or saints, "Pray for us"—which is in plain English to maintain that we pray to the saints to have mercy on us; to forgive us our sins, and that we give them the adoration and worship which is justly and exclusively due to God. This is precisely the charge

\* They allude to the Papal allocation of 1853, so nobly resisted by the Protestants in Holland.—Ed.

which you endeavour to establish against us. This is the real question at issue; and to this question, and to this alone, have I applied myself (CATHOLIC LAYMAN for March, 1857, page 33), where I have fully exposed the fallacy of all your attempts, refuted all your arguments, and proved the Catholic doctrine and practice to be perfectly co-ordinate by a rigorous and just application of your own statements. I have proved from your desultory mode of attack—one time endeavouring to convince your readers that we honour the saints with divine worship (Catholic practice), to beg favours of them; another time, that it is "from God" we seek them. And again, that by Catholic doctrine we only treat the saints as joint supplicants—that you do not understand this dogma respecting which you have undertaken to enlighten your Protestant brethren. I had no necessity to prove that the saints are not equal to the supreme God; neither have I attempted to do so. But in proving the Catholic doctrine from the incoherency and instability of your attempts to impugn it, I observed that it followed incontrovertibly from your statements that "we only invoke the saints as intercessors with God, as dependants on His will and bounty; and that by this invocation we confess the infinite omnipotence of God, and the inferiority of the saints compared with Him," &c.; so that you are yourself the first to give a practical example of that "common artifice" which you have so quaintly described, it being the only possible means to escape the pressure of my troublesome argument. The weapons which you endeavoured to aim with a deadly precision at the vitals of the Catholic doctrine have recoiled with a ten-fold force upon yourself.

You assert, indeed, "that Catholics make vows to the saints—that the Eucharist is offered to their honour—special months and days of the week dedicated to them, almsgiving and other works of religion done to please them;" but these statements are perfectly gratuitous and unfounded, save in your own imagination. Catholics know they do none of these things, nor can any quotation from Catholic prayers prove it, except in the detached and mutilated form in which you cite them. The first proof you give—"We fly to thy protection, holy Mother of God. Despire not our prayers in our necessities; but deliver us at all times from all evil"—is miserably deficient, and wretchedly forced from its original meaning, which shows that all the protection, all the deliverance, &c., consists in the words "pray for us." This is the burden of the address—"Pray for us." Why have you omitted it? The other proofs (!) which you give are of the same character, and need no notice further than to observe that they are all premature, as you should first disprove the arguments adduced by me in my letter referred to above. In fact, it is only another instance of that common artifice so frequently resorted to, to escape the difficulty of a troublesome argument. A glance at the calendar of the Church of England will show that Protestants dedicate as many days to the saints as Catholics do; so that, if we transgress in this respect, they are equally criminal. We do not confess to the saints and angels in the same manner that we confess to God, though confessing to God and the saints at the same time. We confess to God that we are guilty of having sinned against Him; and we confess to the saints and angels, as witnesses, not alone of our transgressions, but also as witnesses of our repentance (Luke xv. 7), and that they may pray for us.

Your formidable argument of "pluri-presence" is as hostile to the sentiments expressed by our Lord in the foregoing text as it is to the invocation of saints. If it be impossible for the saints and angels to know the desires, and to be sensible of the invocations of the faithful scattered over the whole extent of Christendom, it must be equally impossible for them to be cognisant of the hidden thoughts and feelings of repentant sinners scattered as widely over the earth as the former; and yet our Lord assures us that they have perfect knowledge of the latter. Now, will you call the principle by which the angels and saints are enabled to discover all the repentant sinners, now at this moment, on the face of the earth—and they are, no doubt, hundreds of thousands—will you, I say, call this principle *pluri-presence*? Have you any name for it? The angel who showed St. John the numerous mysteries, both of heaven and earth, recorded in the Revelations, must have been highly gifted with your *pluri-presence* principles; and yet this angel says to St. John, "I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren"—Rev. xix. 10. Can you explain how he could be cognisant of so many wonderful things at the same time, and, nevertheless, not be omniscient? Is not this a proof that the saints in heaven know something, nay, a great deal, relative to the condition of the faithful on earth—"The four living creatures and the four and twenty elders fall down before the Lamb," &c.; and say, "Thou hast made us unto our God kings and priests, and we shall reign on the earth?"—Rev. v. 10. But I have gone far enough to show that your *pluri-presence* bulwark cannot stand the light of Scripture authority. I proved beyond contradiction, in my last letter, that the saints in heaven are equal to the angels, and that both are specially employed to minister to the spiritual necessities of mankind on earth. You assert that "the saints are not, before the union of their souls and bodies (that is, after the final resurrection), employed like the angels in ministering to the saints on earth." I must, then, understand you to mean that the saints are to minis-

ter to the faithful on earth after the resurrection, and "to reign over the nations, and to rule them with a rod of iron," &c. This and your *pluri-presence* argument are undoubtedly worthy of each other: let me have Scripture proof that they shall have nations on the earth to reign over and to minister to after the resurrection. Any one can see with a glance that the text you adduce has no relation at all to the question at issue; not so Luke xx. 85, 86, when our Lord assures us that "they that shall be accounted worthy of that world, &c., are equal to the angels," &c.

Again, you endeavour to ignore the direct testimony of Origen, as given by your own translation, by saying, with a degree of doubt, "that Origen thought there was reason to believe that the departed saints pray for their brethren on earth;" but the sentiments of Origen in this case are expressed without the slightest shadow of doubt, when he says, "the angels, souls, and spirits, co-operate with those who wish to worship the supreme God; they join their prayers, requests, and kindly offices with theirs," &c. Can you show that Origen did not believe these statements of his to be true? No, you cannot. Then you should inform your Protestant brethren that they may lawfully, without any danger of superstition or idolatry, believe that "the angels, souls, and spirits" can "recognise them," if they are "worthy of the favour of God;" that they promote their interests with God, and help them with "their prayers, requests, and kindly offices." And you should further inform them, that it is plain from this passage that Origen held the saints to be equally and spiritually employed with the angels in governing and directing the spiritual affairs of the servants of God upon the earth. And having instructed them thus, you should go a step farther, and tell them they can incur no risk of idolatry or superstition by still copying after Origen, and invoking the angels by a rhetorical apostrophe, as he has done, and as you assert the other fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries practised; you can say, by a rhetorical apostrophe, holy angels and saints pray for us!

Now, I wish to be informed how a person can say, by a rhetorical apostrophe, "Come, O angel, and instruct me," &c.; or, "Holy saint, pray for me," &c.; and that he can do all this rhetorically without any crime against God, which, practically and essentially, you say, is idolatry? Give us proofs that Origen and the Fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries, who not alone inculcated this doctrine by their preaching and writings, but also by their practice, entrenched themselves behind that formidable bulwark, a rhetorical apostrophe, to impose upon the credulity and simplicity of their auditors. Where have these Fathers explained to their auditors that their teachings, in this respect, were mere rhetorical apostrophes—figurative expressions which meant nothing? Give their authority that such is the case: we cannot, nor will not, take your word for it. The authority of Du Pin alone secures the passage of Origen from the homily on Ezekiel against all the terrors of your criticism.

In CATHOLIC LAYMAN for March, 1857, page 34, column 3, you say "you have fully admitted, &c., that the Roman Catholic theory is that it is from God that the saints derive whatever power they have of complying with the petitions addressed to them;" that is, you admit we only ask the saints to pray for us. This is decidedly the theory of Catholics on this point, and in this theory every learned Catholic, at least, is carefully educated. He is taught to pray to God for mercy and forgiveness of sin, &c., and to say to the saints, *pray with me, and for me to God*. And how Catholics thus taught carefully to make this distinction between the prayers addressed to God and their addresses to the saints can so far depart from this theory, even in their first practical attempt, and do this also unconsciously, and, as you assert, a little lower down in the same column, "in practice pray to the saints as direct dispensers of grace, assistance, and safety." Thus you maintain that we ignore God; again telling your readers, page 28, column 1: "Roman Catholics, also, avowedly worship the saints with a religious worship;" that is, with the worship due to God, and instead of God, and the reason why we do so, you tell them, is, that we "say Christ is too high, too holy, for us, sinful creatures, to approach." This is wonderful intelligence. Will you only give us some proof of its truth? You cannot. The very statements are at variance with common sense, and prove your total want of all argument, except mystification and sophistry can be counted such.

Again, you contend that when we say "I confess to Almighty God, to blessed Mary ever Virgin, &c.," we cannot distinguish "the amount of devotion due to each, &c.;" that "this distinction is merely ideal, and utterly unpractical;" that "the charge of idolatry is justly preferred against us," &c. How did St. Paul distinguish between the worship due to God and Christ Jesus and to the elect angels, when he confessed them to be joint witnesses of his charge to Timothy? (1 Tim. v. 21.) How did "the congregation (1 Chron. xxix. 20) bow down their heads and worship the Lord, and the king (David)," and distinguish practically, as the act of worship was one between God and the king? If your reasoning be genuine, you must condemn both St. Paul and this congregation of idolatry; this, I fancy, you will not attempt to do; neither can you condemn Catholics if you do them equal justice. The merits of the saints are also another object of attack. To partake of the merits of the saints may be very distasteful

to you, but it did not seem so to St. Augustine, who, in Lib. xx., cap. 21, contra Faust. page 247, says—"The Christian people celebrate with a religious solemnity the memory of the martyrs, that they may be excited to imitate them, that they may be partners in their merits, and that they may be assisted by their prayers." *Populus autem Christianus memorias martyrum religiosa solemnitate celebrat, et ad exilandum imitationem, et ut meritis eorum consocietur, atque orationibus adjuvetur.* And this he maintains against the heretic Faustus, who denied that the saints ought to be honoured and invoked; so that in this respect St. Augustine must be as obnoxious to your charge of idolatry, and of praying to the saints as direct dispensers of grace, assistance, and safety, as any poor Romanist of the present day.

That Origen held the same opinion as St. Augustine regarding the merits and prayers of the saints is incontrovertible from the passage which you claim the credit of having translated correctly (CATHOLIC LAYMAN, April, 1856, p. 47); for what but their merits could give efficacy to their prayers, requests, and kindly in behalf of the faithful on earth? The sufferings of the saints are the sufferings of Christ: then the merits of the saints are the merits of the passion and death of Christ. Will you dispute it? However learned your application of *Latria* may be, it must give way to that of a more learned and a greater authority, the great St. Augustine, already cited, and in the very page referred to above. Having observed that the martyrs are to be worshipped, and in what manner, he says, "But surely with that worship which in Greek is called *Latria*, and which cannot be expressed by one word in Latin, being a service due alone to the Divinity, we neither worship them (the martyrs) nor teach them to be worshipped, but God alone." *At vero illo cultu, qui Græce LATRIA dicitur, Latine uno verbo dici non potest, cum sit quedam proprie Divinitati debita servitus, nec colimus, nec colendum docemus nisi unum Deum.* This is unexceptionable authority, on which I may fairly assert that the consent of antiquity is decidedly against you. But in addition to this, he says (De civit. Dei, Lib. x., cap. 1.), "Hic est Deitati debitus cultus, propter quem uno verbo significandum, quoniam satis idoneum non occurrit Latinum, Græco ubi necesse est, insinuo quid velim dicere. LATRIAM quippe nostri, ubicunque Scripturarum positum est, interpretati sunt servitumem. Sed ea servitus quæ debetur hominibus secundum quam præcepit Apostolus, 'servos Dominis suis subditos esse debere,' alio nomine Græcè nuncupari solet. LATRIA vero secundum consuetudinem, qua locuti sunt qui nobis divina eloquia condiderunt, aut semper, aut tam frequenter ut pene semper, ea dicitur servitus, quæ pertinet ad colendum Deum." "This is a worship due to the Deity, and to express it in one word recourse is had to the Greek, as no Latin word of equal import is to be found. And this word *Latria*, wherever it occurs in the Scriptures, our writers have interpreted (servitumem) service; but that service (servitus) which is due to men, according to the precept of the Apostle, 'Servants ought to be obedient to their lords,' is expressed by another Greek word. But *Latria*, conformable to the usage of those who delivered to us the divine oracles, is always, or for the most part, called that service by which God is worshipped." This, I am confident, explodes your attempt to prove that even technically we are guilty of applying to the worship of God a word which, you say, "signifies bondage, or the service of a slave." But the authority of Augustine and of the Church, both before and in his time, as he asserts, are decidedly against you, and prove that the distinction suggested by *Latria* and *Doula* was not, as you assert, then, no more than now, "in matter of fact, and practically, a mere nullity." The titles ascribed to the Blessed Virgin are another rock of scandal to you; and yet all that is expected from her is, that she can obtain from the Almighty whatever she seeks, and that in no other way than by joining her prayers, requests, &c., with ours. If these titles offend you, the epithets bestowed on the Blessed Virgin by St. Cyril, in his sermon before the Council of Ephesus, and which therefore had the sanction of the Fathers of the Council, and consequently of the whole Church, must be rank blasphemy in your sight.

Will you show me, in the race of Adam, a mother that ever had such a son, or a son who had such a mother, and then I will grant the propriety of your objections? The mystery accomplished in her ranks superlatively beyond any of the saints, even Moses, and yet God gave Moses his own name, *Elohim* (Exod. vii. 1). I have barely room to say that I regret I could not be more concise in my remarks at present.

I am, sir, yours, &c.,  
EDMOND POWER.

April 2, 1857.

We have not space to notice in detail every point touched on incidentally by Mr. Power in the foregoing long letter, and must, therefore, confine ourselves for the present to the principal topics contained in it.

We have had two questions with Mr. Power: one as to the doctrines of the Church of Rome, and the other as to the doctrine of Origen. With regard now to the theory of the Church of Rome we are pretty well agreed, and our only difference is, as to her practice. As our correspondent finds it hard to conceive how any such difference can exist, we shall give him an illustration

a Cyril, Alex., Tom. II. 72; E. Paris, 1673.

which will make our meaning clearer. In the British Constitution the Prime Minister cannot make a peer, nor can he appoint a judge, or a secretary of state, &c.; all he can do is to *recommend* to the Queen the persons whom he thinks fitted for those offices, and ask *her* to appoint them. Such, at least, is the theory. But in practice every one knows that the real power of appointment to vacant offices rests with the minister of the day; that the Queen often has no choice but to appoint the person named by him; and that any one looking for promotion to a high office would find it a more effectual way of gaining his object to make himself useful to the minister than to gain the Queen's personal favour. Now, the Roman Catholic theory is, that the Virgin Mary has no more power to do anything for us than Lord Palmerston has to give away a vacant ribbon of the Garter. But in practice, one who enlists the Virgin on his side is as sure of gaining his request as a nobleman who has got the promise of the Ribbon from the minister is sure of obtaining it. Not only so, but prayer through the Virgin is represented as a *more* effectual way of gaining our desires than a direct address to God. We need only refer to the well-known story told by St. Ligouri, of brother Leo's vision of the two ladders, "one of them was red; at its summit stood Jesus Christ; the other was white; at its top he saw the Virgin Mary. He saw that some who twice attempted to ascend the red ladder fell back. They were then exhorted to ascend the white ladder. The Blessed Virgin stretched out her hand to them, and they securely ascended to Paradise." These are the practical consequences to which the theory of saintly intercession has been pushed in the Roman Catholic Church, and these we reject as unscriptural, or rather as anti-scriptural.

Mr. Power says that his Church teaches that the saints are infinitely below God. Very possibly; but if she also teaches that the saints are immeasurably above us, the danger is as great of their practically shutting out God from the minds of the people. A low mountain that is near will shut out the view of a higher one farther off.

Does Mr. Power suppose that the ancient heathens thought all their gods to possess equal power? Let him read the description given by Homer (Book viii.) of the infinite superiority of Jupiter to the other gods. But yet, because these other gods were supposed to possess power far beyond that of man, they were honoured and worshipped not the less, in spite of this belief in their inferiority to Jupiter.

Mr. Power speaks of the Virgin and the saints as doing no more than "joining their requests with ours." A singular kind of partnership this, where all the contributions of any value are made by one side. A beggar might as well ask Baron Rothschild to enter into partnership with him, and then say that he had not asked the baron to give him anything, but only to join his wealth to his.

Mr. Power accuses us of mutilating the Roman Catholic prayers which we quoted, by leaving out the words, "pray for me." We omitted these words because we did not find them. We quoted these prayers to show that while the theory is that every prayer to a saint is a request to that saint to pray for us, in practice we find those prayers containing direct requests to the saints to grant us blessings; while these words, "pray for us," are not expressed, but left to be understood by those who may think of it.

Mr. Power meets with a denial our statement that "Roman Catholics make vows to saints; that the Eucharist is offered to their honour; special months and days of the week dedicated to them; alms-giving and other works of religion done to please them;" and says that these statements are perfectly gratuitous and unfounded, save in our own imaginations. Mr. Power must count very much on the ignorance of the Protestant readers of the LAYMAN, and yet in Ireland there are few Protestants who do not know so much of Roman Catholic practices as to be aware that the month of May, among the months, and Saturday among the days of the week, is dedicated to the Virgin Mary; while a little further acquaintance with Roman Catholics would convince them of the perfect truth of the rest of our statement. It was quite open to Mr. Power to defend those practices, but that he should venture to deny them, trusting, we suppose, to some future mode of explaining away his denial, was a piece of equivocation which we did not expect from Mr. Power.

We come next to Origen. Mr. Power, assuming that he has proved Origen to be on his side, desires us to tell our Protestant readers that they may, without fear of superstition, use invocation of saints, because Origen did the same. We have a double answer to this. Origen did *not* use invocation of saints; and if he had done so, it would have been nothing to us.

In discussing the sentiments of Origen, or any other father, Protestants have everything to gain and nothing to lose. They reject invocation of saints, not because Origen did not use it, but because they do not find it in the Bible. The Scriptures everywhere speak of Jesus as the only Mediator of the New Dispensation, and they nowhere contain a precept, nor an example, nor the slightest encouragement of any kind to address our prayers to God through any channel but through Him. This we regard as decisive. After this any examination into the sentiments of Origen has for Protestants only a historical interest. It may be interesting to inquire whether the superstitious invocation of saints had crept into the Church in his time

or not. If it had it would not make a practice lawful which Scripture condemns. But if it should appear that the Church in Origen's day knew nothing whatever of such a practice, then the Roman Catholic advocate is driven out of his last stronghold, and is proved to be unable to supply by tradition the failure of Scripture proof.

Now, as to the opinions of Origen there can really be no doubt whatever. Any one who has read his treatise against Celsus must feel it to be a matter beyond all controversy that Origen disapproved of addressing petitions of any kind to any but Almighty God, and that he disapproved of the use of any intercession or mediation in approaching God, save that of Jesus Christ.

"We must pray to GOD ALONE, who is over all things, and we must pray, also, to the only begotten Word of God, the first born of every creature; and first coming to Him, we must implore Him, as our High Priest, to bear our prayers to His Father and our Father, to His God and our God.—Cont. Celsus, lib. viii., vol. i., p. 761. Every request, and prayer, and supplication, and thanksgiving must be sent up to Him who is God over all, through the High Priest who is above all angels, even the living Word of God. And we also make our requests to the Word, and supplicate Him, and, moreover, offer our prayer to Him. For it is not reasonable for us to call upon angels, &c.—Cont. Celsus, lib. v., vol. i., p. 579. (See the passage quoted in full, CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. v., p. .)

Origen repeatedly says that the help of the angels is to be obtained by asking God for it; he says that the angels all help those who love God, *without being asked*; and we are glad to quote in full a passage to which we alluded, from memory, last month, in which Origen illustrates the way in which their help may be obtained:—

"For not in vain do the angels of God ascend and descend upon the Son of man; conspicuous by their eyes illuminated with the light of knowledge, even during the very time of prayer reminded by him who supplicates of what things he who prays stands in need, they effect what they are able, as having received a general commission. But we must use some such similitude as this, in this matter, in order to show forth what is meant by us. Suppose that there stand by one who, labouring under ill health, is praying diligently, an upright physician who knows in what way to treat the illness regarding which that man offers up his prayer, it is manifest that he will be moved to cure him who prays, probably, not without cause, surmising that this is also the design of God, who has hearkened to the prayer of the suppliant for the removal of the sickness. Or, suppose one of those who possess in abundance the necessities of life should hear the prayer of a poor man who puts up his supplication to God even for the necessities (of life), it is evident that this man also will accomplish for the poor man the object of his prayer, becoming the minister of the will of the Father who brought to the same spot at the time of that prayer one who was able to minister to the suppliant, and who, on account of the readiness of his disposition, is unable to overlook the man who stands in need of such things. Wherefore, as these things when they happen are not to be thought to happen by chance, He who has *numbered all the hairs of the head of the saints*, bringing harmoniously to the spot at the time of that prayer one who will be to the suppliant the minister of his beneficence, attentively listening to him who prays with faith, so are we to account that at times the presence of the angels, who are overseeing and ministering to God, is brought about for such an one who is praying, that they may conspire with him for those things which the suppliant has been deemed worthy of (or has prayed for).—De Oratione, vol. i., p. 214.

This passage shows clearly that Origen had no idea of obtaining the help of angels by direct prayers to them, but by prayer to God, which they, in His providence, overhearing, might know that it was His will that they should bear assistance. It shows, also, that he did not interpret the statement that "there is joy among the angels over one sinner that repenteth," as if every angel knew everything that happened on earth, or were able to hear petitions offered in all places, since it is clear, from the above, that only those angels who were present at the place of prayer were supposed by Origen to be capable of hearing the prayer.

The following quotation will show how far Origen was from venturing to assert that departed saints are employed, as well as angels, in ministering to men on earth:—

"But now, whether the saints who are removed from the body, and are with Christ, act at all and labour for us, like the angels who minister to our salvation, or whether, again, the wicked removed from the body act at all according to the purpose of their own mind, like the bad angels with whom, it is said by Christ, that they will be sent into eternal fires, let this, too, be considered among the secret things of God—mysteries, not to be committed to writing."

Mr. Power asks us, "How any one can say by a rhetorical apostrophe, *Come, O angel, and instruct me, or holy saint pray for me*." Will Mr. Power be pleased to show us where Origen has said, *Come, O angel, and instruct me, or holy saint pray for me*? If he had said so, we should have acknowledged these to be prayers. A prayer is an address to some definite person in behalf of some definite person. In the words, *Come, angel, and instruct one that is wandering in error, no one can say who is prayed to, or who is prayed for*. This is not a

prayer to an angel, but a rhetorical exhortation to him to glorify God by performing the work assigned to him by God. The Church of England might as well be accused of using prayers to the saints, because she retains in her service the words "Oh, ye spirits and souls of the righteous, bless ye the Lord; praise Him, and magnify Him for ever."

Mr. Power has given us the best proof that no prayers to saints can be found in Origen by showing that he was forced to alter Origen's words before he could get an example of the kind in his works.

What we have said all proceeds on the supposition that the words in question really were penned by Origen. But we said, in the last number, that this was extremely uncertain, the homily in which the words occur being only extant in a Latin translation of very doubtful fidelity. Mr. Power now tells us that all doubts as to the words being Origen's are removed by the authority of Du Pin.

Well, it is rather hard to expect us to receive the Roman Catholic Du Pin as infallible authority; more especially as we had produced, on the other side, Roman Catholic authority—namely, the Benedictine editors—in proof of the general character of the Latin translations of Origen. However, as Mr. Power has appealed to Du Pin, we have referred to Du Pin, and what do our readers suppose he says?

"We have none of Origen's Scholia remaining, and we have hardly any of his Homilies in Greek, and those which we have in Latin are translated by Rufinus and others with so much liberty that it is a difficult matter to discern what is Origen's own from what has been foisted in by the interpreters." He adds, in a note:—"Rufinus says this himself in the conclusion to his version of the Commentaries on the Romans, and St. Jerome, also, somewhere upbraids him with it. St. Jerome's own versions are not more exact."

Further, in his enumeration of Origen's works he reckons the Homilies on Jeremiah and Ezekiel, translated by St. Jerome. He adds—"Twelve of the Homilies on Jeremiah are also in Greek, but the translation differs very much from the Greek."

We think it incredible that Mr. Power could have quoted Du Pin as decisive in his favour, if he had ever opened the book, as he would have found him confirming every word of what we had said as to the impossibility of knowing whether a sentence in one of these Latin homilies emanated from Origen himself, or was foisted in by the interpreters. And we think that if Mr. Power is anxious to preserve a character for learning and candour, he has got a lesson now to be careful in future how he quotes a book without first looking into it.

#### WHY CAN'T THE PRIESTS PUT DOWN DISCUSSION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

MR. EDITOR,—When last I met Jerry, he says to me, "We've had great doings in Keelvenogue lately." "What was it about?" says I. "Why," says he, "Mr. M., a great disputer, was sent down by the Catholic Defence Association, and got ten shillings a week (as I hear tell), and whatever he could make besides. So he set up lecturing, and proving that our religion was the right one, and, signs on it, the people came to him in crowds. Myself never thought they were half so eager for controversy; but then I seen that though they pertended not to care about the Protestant lectures, they *did* care about them, and felt them sorely. It vexed them to say that the priests never met the ministers, and they were delighted to hear that any one was standing up for their religion. So they went in crowds to hear him, and, sure enough, 'twas he that rattled the sixpences out of their pockets in style." "And," says I, "what did Father John think of it? He's so much against discussion that I wouldn't wonder if he was down upon Mr. M. for controverting at all." "Well," says Jerry, "I was puzzled about that myself; but, anyhow, I'll give you my interpretation of the matter. To the best of my belief, Father John would rather have no discussion at all; and he was almost as much against the Catholic disputers as against the Protestant ones; and he sent Humphrey Carey away out of the place altogether too, as I told you some time ago," because he used to be disputing. But the boys were creeping on by degrees, and getting a liking for discussion, and the Douay Bibles were going through the country, and the books on controversy were lent about, and the boys were holding discussions among themselves, and there was so much talk about it that 'twas no use trying to stifle it; for when 'twas put down in one place, it broke out in another. So, to the best of my belief, when Father John saw that it couldn't be put down by force, he thought it might quiet the boys to let them hear enough of it; so he didn't hinder Mr. M. from lecturing, or the boys from going to hear him." "But," says I, "did he favour him at all, or notice him from the altar?" "No," says he; "Father John knew a trick worth two of that. He was just civil and distant to him before the people. He didn't take any gr at notice of him, or mix himself up with him at all; but myself thinks he was patting him on the back all the time on the sly." "But," says I, "why would he carry the double faces that way?" "Well," says Jerry, "here's my interpretation of it. If Mr. M.